### Full Shell

A: The aff must specify what type of rehabilitative programs he or she advocates for in the form of a text in the 1AC. The text must be clearly delineated from other arguments via spacing or bolding.

B:

C:

Weighing ground-

I don’t know the scope of your impacts because I don’t know what you defend doing. This makes weighing impossible because I don’t know how much of your benefits you can claim. The size of the programs and the method used clearly affects how much you can solve.

And, saying you defend all links is impossible since

Firstly, programs have entirely different methods that overlap – you can’t psychoanalyze, assign community service, and give them cognitive therapy all at the same time. Means under your interp, the aff defends a contradictory advocacy, which means you’d have 0 ground.

Secondly, that’s worse for weighing since it’s impossible to compare two specific systems. Reasons why a restorative justice advantage is good are not competitive with a disad to MST.

[And specificity of programs affects weighing even under means based theories – for example, a turn would be given stronger weight if you defended shock therapy than vocational programs]

Weighing ground is key since comparison gets arguments closer to the ballot.

2. Ground

There is no possibility for 1AR shift underneath my interp because you are bound to an advocacy that can be referenced during and after the round. Anything else risks nullification of 100% of my constructive ground since you can re-clarify what you defended in the 1AR to escape disads and NCs. Ground is key to fairness since we both need arguments to win.

Prefer a text since I can hold you to it as opposed to CX questions we don’t have memorized and can’t access later.

And reasons why CX is better don’t prove that a text isn’t also good – we can still ask clarification questions in my world.

But, CX is primarily for strategy, not to find out what you defend, so I shouldn’t have to ask. And this outweighs time spent outlining your advocacy – that takes seconds as opposed to a line of questioning that can last minutes.

### Short Voter

Fairness- your ballot asks who did the better debating, not the better cheating which is impossible to evaluate if someone has a structural disadvantage. Use competing interpretations; my standards determine what is reasonable. Drop the debater: the substantive level of the debate is skewed, you’ve claimed advantages by running the unfair arguments that have altered my time – it’s unfair if you read a million unfair arguments and kick them when I read theory.

[No RVIs, you get a 2-1 advantage since could’ve chosen to run a counter interp or access fairness with you bite or even a new shell. It’s harder for me to win – my offense to fairness is in the form of a violation, you just prove your position is fair and you win. Also, the chilling effect, if RVIs, I’m incentivized not to run theory to check abuse, meaning affs get to be as abusive as they want.]

### Long Voter

Fairness- your ballot asks who did the better debating not the better cheating which is impossible to evaluate if someone has a structural disadvantage.

Use competing interpretations, since I don’t know what you think is reasonable. My standards should be a metric.

This implies an offense defense paradigm on theory; interps are preferable if there are proactive reasons to prefer them, not just no abuse claims.

Even if reasonability, still use offense defense since mitigation should never be sufficient to win, otherwise one million no warrant arguments win the theory debate.

[Competing interps is about setting a rule we should debate underneath, so there needs to be an explicit counter-interpretation. I can’t weigh the preferability of a world they haven’t outlined. This is not a norms argument: we still need a defined rule to tell us what is good in this round.]

Drop the debater: the substantive level of the debate round is skewed, you’ve claimed structural advantages by running the unfair arguments in the fisrt place that have altered my strategy and time. I wouldn’t have engaged other levels if I had known the argument would just be dropped.

No RVIs, you get a 2-1 advantage since could’ve chosen to win off my theory or access fairness with a new shell or you bite. You still structurally access the fairness voter, but its bad if one debater can win off of proving they’re consistent with fairness and the other debater has to prove a proactive violation. Also, the chilling effect, if RVIs, I’m incentivized not to run theory to check abuse, meaning affs get to be as abusive as they want.

### AT It Would Exclude Neg Positions

1. This is just a reason why narrow affs are bad – you can defend all programs, you just have to specify that you did.
2. I accept that trade off – if I accept that I would rather get better weighing than more positions, then there’s no abuse

### AT I Would’ve Granted You The Ground

1. Proves the abuse – you clarify in the 1ar, but if I hadn’t run the shell you would’ve shifted